

REMARKS

Consideration of the amendments to the application is respectfully requested. The amendments are made pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.116 and 1.121. No new matter has been entered.

Status of Claims

Claims 27-47 are pending in this application.

Claims 27-47 stand rejected.

Claims 1-26 are cancelled.

Claims

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel et al. (US 6,211,874) in view of Kaply (US 6,215,490)

In paragraph 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 2-5, 27, 29, 30, 31-34 and 40-43 as being unpatentable over Himmel et al. (US 6,211,874) in view of Kaply (US 6,215,490). Claims 2-5 have been cancelled. Applicant traverses the rejection of Claims 27, 29, 30, 31-34 and 40-43 for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 27 reads as follows:

27. *A method for selecting and simultaneously displaying a plurality of digitally stored objects, comprising the steps of:*

displaying a two dimensional array of digitally stored objects;

selecting a plurality of digitally stored objects from the two dimensional array of digitally stored objects, wherein each one of the selected plurality of digitally stored objects has at least one dynamically linked associated destination object;

after the selecting step, retrieving the at least one dynamically linked destination object associated for each one of the selected plurality of digitally stored objects all together; and

simultaneously displaying all together each one of the retrieved associated

destination objects.

The Examiner acknowledges that Himmel **does not** teach a two-dimensional array of graphical thumbnails. The Examiner then modifies Himmel with a two-dimensional array of graphical thumbnails by citing US 6,215,490 by Kaply and refers to FIG. 5A of Kaply. However, the illustration in FIG. 5A of Kaply **cannot** be interpreted as a two-dimensional array since the first row has 5 icons and the second row has 4 icons, the 4 icons are spread over the same distance as the 5 icons. Furthermore, Kaply **does not** use the term “array” and **does not** use the term “two-dimensional.” While the icons are displayed over multiple lines, the icons **are not** described as being arranged in a row and column format or a “two-dimensional array,” as explicitly claimed.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Claim 27 is allowable over the combination of Himmel as modified by Kaply and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn. Since Claims 28-31 depend from independent Claim 27, then for the same reasons set forth above with regard to Claims 28-31, these dependent claims are also allowable over the combination of Himmel as modified by Kaply and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Claim 32 reads as follows:

32. *A system for displaying content viewed on a display device, comprising:*

an electronic document page displaying simultaneously together a plurality of scrolling sub-framed arrays, each sub-framed array containing a plurality of thumbnails, each sub-framed array able to be independently and selectively stopped and scrolled at a selective speed by a viewer or website operator.

Himmel and Kaply, individually or in combination, **do not** teach a “*plurality of scrolling sub-framed arrays*”. Himmel only teaches stacked windows, each window being a separate page, as disclosed in column 7, lines 25-30. Thus, the windows of Himmel are not described as

“sub-framed arrays,” especially in view of the scope of the specification. Like Himmel, Kaply teaches stacked windows.

Furthermore, Himmel **does not** teach “*an electronic document page displaying simultaneously together a plurality of scrolling sub-framed arrays*,” as claimed. With regard to the present invention, the “*plurality of scrolling sub-framed arrays*” are displayed via a single “*page*” so that the “*arrays*” share the same tool bar and navigational bar of such “*page*”. In Himmel, as best seen in FIG. 5C, each link is displayed via its own “*page*” wherein such “*page*” has its own tool bar and navigational bar. As described in column 7, lines 29-33 of Himmel, the windows can be “maximized” so that they operate in a full-sized mode.


Similarly, the Kaply **does not** teach “*an electronic document page displaying simultaneously together a plurality of scrolling sub-framed arrays*,” as claimed. Instead, Kaply displays stacked windows.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Claim 32 is allowable over the combination of Himmel as modified by Kaply and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn. Since Claims 33-46 depend from independent Claim 32, then for the same reasons set forth above with regard to Claims 33-46, these dependent claims are also allowable over the combination of Himmel as modified by Kaply and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, the Applicant believes that they have overcome all of the examiner's basis for rejection, and that this application therefore stands in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner is of the opinion that such action can not be taken, the Applicant requests that he contact their undersigned attorney at (908) 654-8000 in order to resolve any outstanding issues without the necessity of issuing another Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,




Jean-Marc Zimmerman, Esq.
Reg. No. 36,978
226 St. Paul Street
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-8000

Dated: October 17, 2003
Westfield, New Jersey

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that on October 17, 2003, I caused the Amendment for U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/544,036, a Request for a One Month Extension of Time to Respond, and a check in the amount of \$55.00 to be mailed by first class mail to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



Jean-Marc Zimmerman